



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/705,614

11/10/2003

James F. Hainfeld

16049Z

4692

23389 7590 08/27/2008
SCULLY SCOTT MURPHY & PRESSER, PC
400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA
SUITE 300
GARDEN CITY, NY 11530

EXAMINER

HOPKINS, CHRISTINE D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3735

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/27/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/705,614	Applicant(s) HAINFELD ET AL.	
	Examiner CHRISTINE D. HOPKINS	Art Unit 3735	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) CHRISTINE D. HOPKINS. (3) Charles Marmor, II.

(2) Xiaochun Zhu, Reg. No. 56,311. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 26 August 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 69.

Identification of prior art discussed: Esenaliev (U.S. Patent No. 6,165,440), Patel (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0180917).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant argued that the interpretation given by the Examiner with respect to claim 69 was unreasonable based on the claim language. The Examiner indicated that a new search would be conducted upon formal submission, and entry of, the proposed amendment to claim 69.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

	/Charles A. Marmor, II/ SPE, Art Unit 3735
--	---